REMARKS

In response to the final office action dated August 24, 2007, Applicant is amending claims 1, 3-4, 12, 14 and 16-17. This includes all the independent claims 1, 12 and 14. As such, claims 1-20 remain pending. Favorable consideration of the claims as amended is requested.

Claim 1 is being amended with further language about the recited association. In particular, claim 1 now states that the electronic document has an existing association, that has previously been defined, with another document and not with at least one unassociated document among multiple electronic documents. Similar changes are made in the other independent claims 12 and 14, and some corresponding changes are made in a few dependent claims.

The amendments are supported by the present disclosure, for example in the description of the opportunity record, activity record and sales order described with reference to Figure 1 (spec. 4;11—7:24.)

No new matter is added.

Rejection under section 103

Claims 1-20 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,313,855 (Shuping) in view of U.S. 20030052920 (Carter).

This rejection is rendered moot by the above amendments. Without conceding that the rejection has merit, Applicant notes the following differences between the cited references and the present subject matter.

Claim 1 recites a method to be performed in a computer system having stored therein an electronic documents that has an existing association with another electronic documents and not with at least one unassociated document among multiple electronic documents. The first step of claim 1 recites a "displaying a view ..." step and the second step recites a "displaying ... an input control ..." step. Stated briefly, the electronic document already has one of the types of intrinsic associations with another document when it is displayed ("having previously been defined"). Two types of intrinsic associations are recited in the claim. Moreover, the input control states which of the electronic documents is a follow up of the other and provides

navigation to the associated document and not to the unassociated document. Shuping does not disclose, among other features, the types of intrinsic associations recited in the claims, and Carter's documents do not even have intrinsic associations with each other.

Shuping is taken as characterized in Applicant's response to a previous office action. The Examiner conceded that Shuping fails to expressly teach that a user-selectable command should be displayed that identifies the intrinsic association; the types of intrinsic associations; stating which document is a follow up, and the input control. [Office action page 3.] Applicant specifically disagrees with the Examiner's reasoning on page 3, lines 4-19 of the office action, and request that the Examiner identify a proper reference as the basis for every claimed feature.

Carter discloses a document navigation system. [Carter title.] Figure 2B of Carter shows an expanded navigation bar 230 that currently identifies an email message sent at 9:35 A.M. on Thursday, August 10, 2000, which falls within week 32 of that year. [Carter 0040-0041.] If the user clicks on any of the earlier (235) or later (236) buttons, Carter teaches that the system will search for another email matching the new search criteria (e.g., a message sent at 10:15 A.M. on the next day). [Carter 0042.]

Carter nowhere discloses or suggests intrinsic associations between documents. Take, for example, the emails that Carter discusses with regard to Figure 2B. Carter searches these in terms of their respective dates. That is, when navigating from one email using Carter's system (e.g., from the 9:35 email) one might arrive at another email (e.g., the 10:15 one) that is entirely unrelated. And Carter does not describe anything about the navigation bar being able to keep track of documents that are follow ups of each other, because the Carter bar has no such functionality.

It follows that Carter does not disclose or suggest identification of the intrinsic association (whether in a user-selectable command or otherwise), the types of intrinsic associations (e.g., one document being a follow up of the other), or the input control having such a user-selectable command that navigates only to an associated document and not to an unassociated document (because Carter navigates by time and date, etc.).

Accordingly, the present subject matter of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested even by combining Shuping with Carter. The other independent claims 12 and 14 include similar

language and are therefore also patentable over the combined references. The dependent claims are patentable at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

Favorable consideration of claims 1-20 as amended is requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/25/07

J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

60454184.doc